

REMARKS

Claims 9-16 were pending in the application. Claims 9, 11, and 12 have been amended. Claims 17-19 have been added. No claims have cancelled. Therefore, claims 9-19 are pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

Claims 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,842,974 (“Maenishi”). Independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended. The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Maenishi fails to teach or suggest a component placement device that comprises, among other things, a frame and at least two component pick and place units, in which “at least one component pick and place unit is independently moveable relative to the frame in a direction equal to and opposite to a X-direction and in a direction equal to and opposite to a Y-direction” as required by amended claim 1. Furthermore, Maenishi fails to teach or suggest a method for picking-up components that comprises, among other things that “at least one component pick and place unit is independently moveable relative to the frame in a direction equal to and opposite to a X-direction and in a direction equal to and opposite to a Y-direction” as required by amended claim 12.

The Examiner contends that Maenishi discloses component placement devices (component pick and place units) 38a-38d which pick up components and move independently relative to a transfer head (frame) 28. Maenishi merely discloses that the suction nozzle 34 of each component placement device 38a-38d is capable of moving up and down and can rotate by a θ rotation motor 42a-42b. See Maenishi at col. 13 at lines 51- 67 and Figs. 2 and 3. Clearly, Maenishi fails to disclose a component place device 38a-38d that moves independently relative to the frame “in a direction equal to and opposite to a X-direction and in a direction equal to and opposite to a Y-direction” as required by claims 1 and 12. Furthermore, in a second embodiment, Maenishi merely discloses placement heads 39a-39d that can be controlled independently *only* in *one* direction to space the placement heads 39a-39d by intervals L₁, L₂, L₃. See Maenishi at col. 19, lines 19-36 and Fig. 11a.

Thus, Maenishi does not disclose placement heads 39a-39d that are independently moveable “in a direction equal to and opposite to a X-direction and in a direction equal to and opposite to a Y-direction.” Furthermore, there is no motivation or suggestion in Maenishi to modify the component mounting apparatus 100 to provide a component placement head 38a-38d that is “independently moveable relative to the frame in a direction equal to and opposite to a X-direction and in a direction equal to and opposite to a Y-direction” as required by the claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 and 12.

Claims 10-11 and 13-16 depend from claim 1 or claim 12 and are allowable therewith, for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in these dependent claims.

New Claims 17-19

New independent claim 17 recites a method of picking-up components by a component placement device that comprises, among other things, a moveable frame and at least two component pick and place units, in which the component pick and place units are moved “relative to one another prior to the step of placing the components simultaneously on at least one substrate and after picking-up the components.” Claim 17 further requires that “at least one component pick and place unit is independently moveable relative to the frame in a direction equal to and opposite to a X-direction and in a direction equal to and opposite to a Y-direction.” Maenishi fails to disclose a component place device 38a-38d that moves independently relative to the frame “in a direction equal to and opposite to a X-direction and in a direction equal to and opposite to a Y-direction.” Thus, Applicant respectfully contends that claim 17 is in condition for allowance.

New claims 18-19 depend from claim 17 and are allowable therewith, for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in these dependent claims.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance.
Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Date March 14, 2007

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5483
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Respectfully submitted,

Richard C. Peet
By Reg. No. 34,717


Richard C. Peet
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,792